

U.S. Patent Application No: 10/696,607
Page 15

REMARKS

1. Claims 1-56 are pending in the present application. Claims 1 and 53 have been amended to incorporate the feature "said input portion and separate output portion including waveguide sections that are tilted with respect to the first image plane." Claim 10 has been canceled. Support for the feature added to claims 1 and 53 can be found, for example, in originally filed claim 10. Claim 51 has been amended to correct a mistyping. No new matter has been added.

2. In the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1, 7, 8, and 9 under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 6,388,815 to Collins. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 1 recites "*a plurality of guided-wave optical delay lines, each of said delay lines having an input portion for receiving light at said first image plane and a separate output portion for returning delayed light at said first image plane.*"

Collins describes a time delay mechanism that comprises a set of glass blocks (column 5, lines 5-15 and column 8, line 66 through column 10, line 2). See also elements 30 shown in Figure 5a of Collins. As an alternative to the glass blocks, Collins mentions -but does not describe in detail- the use of an array of optical fibers (column 5, lines 15-16 and column 17, lines 55-58). The person skilled in the art, upon reading of Collins, would implement those optical fibers in the same way as the glass blocks. In other words, the optical fibers would have an

U.S. Patent Application No: 10/696,607

Page 16

entrance end located at the plane of the second auxiliary mirror and would have an optical reflecting surface (or mirror) located at the other end of the optical fiber. Light would enter the fiber from the entrance end and appropriately delayed light would exit the fiber from that same entrance end. Thus, the input and output portions of the fiber in Collins are the same. In sharp contrast, claim 1 recites “[an] input portion and [a] separate output portion.”

Claim 1 as amended also recites that “[the] input portion and separate output portion include[e] waveguide sections that are tilted with respect to the first image plane.” This feature has been taken from claim 10 as originally filed. In view of the fact that the Examiner is of the opinion that claim 10 is not anticipated by Collins, the Applicant infers that the Examiner is also of the opinion that claim 1 as amended is not anticipated by Collins.

Therefore, claim 1 is novel over Collins, together with claims 7, 8 and 9, at least by virtue of their dependency on claim 1.

3. In the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 2, 6, and 10-13 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,266,176 to Anderson. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. In particular, the Applicant submits that the Examiner has not made a prima facie 35 USC 103(a) rejection because claims 2, 6 and 10-13 depend on claim 1 and the Examiner has not shown to the Applicant where, in Collins, “[an] input portion and [a] separate output portion” of the plurality of guided-wave optical delay lines is shown.

U.S. Patent Application No: 10/696,607

Page 17

Moreover, the Applicant disagrees with the statement of the Examiner with reference to claims 10 and 11. According to the Examiner, it would be obvious to tilt the input and output portions of the delay lines. However, the only guided-wave optical delay lines mentioned by Collins are optical fibers. Tilting the ends of optical fibers is discussed as being not practical. See, for example, U.S. Pat. No. 6,674,939 to Anderson (column 4, lines 32-42) and U.S. Pat. No. 6,724,951 to Anderson (column 4, lines 51-62). Both patents have been cited by Applicant in a separate Information Disclosure Statement (IDS). Therefore, tilting of the input and output portions is far from being obvious.

Therefore, claims 2, 6 and 10-13 are patentable over the cited art.

4. In the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 3-5 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins in view Anderson '176 and further in view of U.S. Pub. App. 2002/0061157 to Ducellier. The Applicant respectfully disagrees. In particular, the Applicant submits that the Examiner has not made a prima facie 35 USC 103(a) rejection because claims 3-5 depend on claim 1 and the Examiner has not shown to the Applicant where, in Collins, "*[an] input portion and [a] separate output portion*" of the plurality of guided-wave optical delay lines is shown.

Therefore, claims 3-5 are patentable over the cited art.

5. In the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 14, 15 and 17 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins in view Anderson '176 and further in view of U.S. Pub. App. 2002/0180637 to Stephens. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

U.S. Patent Application No: 10/696,607
Page 18

In particular, the Applicant submits that the Examiner has not made a prima facie 35 USC 103(a) rejection because claims 14, 15 and 17 depend on claim 1 and the Examiner has not shown to the Applicant where, in Collins, "[an] input portion and [a] separate output portion" of the plurality of guided-wave optical delay lines is shown.

Therefore, claims 14, 15 and 17 are patentable over the cited art.

6. In the Action, the Examiner rejects claims 53-56 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Collins in view Anderson '176 and further in view of U.S. Pub. App. 2002/0181874 to Tulchinsky. The Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Claim 53 recites "[an] input portion and [a] separate output portion." The Applicant submits that the Examiner has not made a prima facie 35 USC 103(a) rejection because the Examiner has not shown to the Applicant where, in Collins, "[an] input portion and [a] separate output portion" of the plurality of guided-wave optical delay lines is shown.

Therefore, claims 53-56 are patentable over the cited art.

7. In the Action, the Examiner allows 20-52. The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the indication of allowability of those claims.

8. In the Action, Examiner objects to claims 16, 18 and 19 and states that those claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. The Applicant notes

U.S. Patent Application No: 10/696,607

Page 19

that claims 16, 18 and 19 all depend, directly or indirectly, on independent claim 1 with is deemed to be patentable, as shown above by Applicant. Therefore, the Applicant respectfully submits that rewriting of claims 16, 18 and 19 is not needed.

9. (IDS) The Applicant notes that an Information Disclosure Statement (IDS) has been filed by Applicant on October 19, 2005. The Applicant submits that the currently pending claims are patentable over the art cited in the IDS and respectfully requests the Examiner to consider the IDS on the merits.

* * *

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of all the claims are respectfully solicited.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any additional fees, which may be required or credit overpayment to deposit account no. 12-0415. In particular, if this response is not timely filed, then the Commissioner is authorized to treat

U.S. Patent Application No: 10/696,607
Page 20

this response as including a petition to extend the time period pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136 (a) requesting an extension of time of the number of months necessary to make this response timely filed and the petition fee due in connection therewith may be charged to deposit account no. 12-0415.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is
being deposited with the United States Post
Office via facsimile (571) 273-8300 on

November 29, 2005

(Date of Transmission)

Susan Papp

(Name of Person Transmitting)

Susan Papp

(Signature)

11/29/05

(Date)

Respectfully submitted,

Alessandro Steinfl

Alessandro Steinfl

Attorney for the Applicant

Reg. No. 56, 448

LADAS & PARRY

5670 Wilshire Boulevard,

Suite 2100

Los Angeles, California 90036

(323) 934-2300 voice

(323) 934-0202 facsimile

asteinfl@ladas.com